

Replica symmetry breaking related to a general ultrametric space III: the case of general measure

A.Yu.Khrennikov*, S.V.Kozyrev†

February 6, 2008

Abstract

Family of replica matrices, related to general ultrametric spaces with general measures, is introduced. These matrices generalize the known Parisi matrices. Some functionals of replica approach are computed. Replica symmetry breaking solution is found.

1 Introduction

In the present paper we introduce a very general replica symmetry anzats, and, using this anzats, find a family of replica symmetry breaking solutions with functional freedom. We continue to develop (see also [1], [2]) the new replica symmetry breaking (RSB) anzats, related to pseudodifferential operators on general ultrametric spaces. We consider the case, in which the measure ν at the ultrametric space X under consideration may be arbitrary. We introduce replica matrix of the form, see the next Section for the notations,

$$Q_{IJ} = \sqrt{\nu(I)\nu(J)}T(\sup(I, J)), \quad I, J \in \mathcal{S}_{\min} \quad (1)$$

which we call *the sup-matrix*. This matrix is defined by the function $T(I)$ on the finite subtree $\mathcal{S}$ of some (probably, infinite) directed tree $\mathcal{T}(X)$, related to the ultrametric space X , and by arbitrary measure ν on X (with the only restriction that measures of all balls in X are positive). The difference of this matrix from the considered in [1], [2] is that in the present paper the measure ν is arbitrary.

This approach is motivated by the results of [3], [4], where the equivalence between the family of the Parisi matrices and p -adic pseudodifferential operators was shown, in the sense that the Parisi matrix allows some renumeration of rows and

*International Center for Mathematical Modelling in Physics and Cognitive Sciences, University of Växjö, S-35195, Sweden, e-mail: Andrei.Khrennikov@msi.vxu.se

†Steklov Mathematical Institute, Moscow, Russia, e-mail: kozyrev@mi.ras.ru

columns, that makes the matrix element dependent only on the p -adic norm of the difference between its indices:

$$Q_{ab} = q(|a - b|_p)$$

and, therefore, the corresponding Parisi matrix can be diagonalized by p -adic Fourier transform. Discussion of more general Parisi matrices and the corresponding Fourier transforms may be found in [5]. This result shows that replica symmetry breaking is related to theory of p -adic PDO (pseudodifferential operators), such as the Vladimirov operator D^α [6]. For other developments in p -adic mathematical physics see [7]–[16]. For results of replica method see [17].

In the present paper we, using the theory of PDO on general ultrametric spaces [18], [19], [20], find a very general form (1) of replica matrix, which is obtained by restricting of ultrametric PDO on finite dimensional space of test functions.

We define the variant of the $n \rightarrow 0$ limit procedure for the replica anzats under consideration and a variant of analysis on trees. Varying the free energy in the vicinity of phase transition, we find the replica symmetry breaking equation, which is some integro-differential equation on the tree $\mathcal{S}$ in the sense of the introduced tree analysis (i.e. it has the form of equation with summation and taking of finite differences on the tree). In the case under consideration we are able to find only one solution of the RSB equation — the constant solution, for which $T(J) = T = \text{const}$ (we do not claim that there is no any other solution, but we are not able to find these solutions analytically). Note that in the case under consideration the constant solution (contrary to the case of the Parisi anzats) is highly nontrivial, since in this case the replica matrix depends on arbitrary measure ν :

$$Q_{IJ} = T \sqrt{\nu(I)\nu(J)}$$

and T is some constant. This means that we found the family of RSB solutions with a functional freedom.

Most of the results, presented in this paper, was obtained in papers [1], [2] of the authors for more particular choice of replica matrix, which is obtained from (1) by fixing the measure ν in such a way that the measures of maximal subballs in any ball will be equal. Moreover, for this particular case also some analog of the Parisi replica symmetry breaking solution was obtained.

The structure of the present paper is as follows.

In Section 2 we develop the form of the replica sup-matrix, using the ultrametric pseudodifferential sup-operator (see the Appendix for discussion) of [18], [19], [20].

In Section 3 we develop analysis on trees, see also our previous preprints [1], [2], for the considered case of general measure.

In Section 4 we compute some simple sums for the introduced replica matrices.

In Sections 5 and 6 we generalize the definitions and computations of [1], [2] of the $n \rightarrow 0$ limit procedure for general ultrametric spaces onto the case under consideration.

In Section 7 we find the replica symmetry breaking equation.

In Section 8 we find the constant solution of the replica symmetry breaking equation.

In Section 9 (the Appendix) we put some materials on ultrametric pseudodifferential operators from [20].

2 Ultrametric PDO and replica matrices

In the present section we show that the mentioned block matrices (1) are related to ultrametric pseudodifferential operators (PDO) on ultrametric spaces, considered in [19], [20], see the Appendix for discussion. Our construction is based on a directed tree, which we will denote $\mathcal{T}$ (and which is a tree of balls $\mathcal{T}(X)$ in some ultrametric space X). Consider a subtree $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{T}$ satisfying the following definition.

Definition 1 *The subset $\mathcal{S}$ in a directed tree $\mathcal{T}$ (with the partial order of the kind considered in the Appendix) is called of the regular type, iff:*

- 1) $\mathcal{S}$ is finite;
- 2) $\mathcal{S}$ is a directed subtree in $\mathcal{T}$ (where the direction in $\mathcal{S}$ is the restriction of the direction in $\mathcal{T}$ onto $\mathcal{S}$);
- 3) *The directed subtree $\mathcal{S}$ obey the following property: if $\mathcal{S}$ contains a vertex I and a vertex J : $J < I$, $|IJ| = 1$, then the subtree $\mathcal{S}$ contains all the vertices L in $\mathcal{T}$: $L < I$, $|IL| = 1$.*

Here $|IJ|$ is the distance between vertices of the tree (number of links in the path connecting these vertices).

The maximal vertex in $\mathcal{S}$ we will denote K .

We consider the ultrametric space $X(\mathcal{T})$ with arbitrary measure ν (such that the measure of any ball is positive). Vertices of the tree $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}(X)$ are in one to one correspondence with balls (or disks) in X . We denote by J the ball in X , corresponding to vertex $J \in \mathcal{T}(X)$, and by χ_J we denote the characteristic function of this ball.

For the finite subtree $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{T}$ of the regular type consider the space $D(\mathcal{S})$ ¹, which is the linear span of vectors χ_J with $J \in \mathcal{S}$. We consider this space as the subspace in the space $L^2(X, \nu)$ of quadratically integrable with respect to the measure ν functions on X . Obviously in the space $D(\mathcal{S})$ there is the orthonormal basis $\left\{ \frac{\chi_J}{\sqrt{\nu(J)}} \right\}$ with J running over the minimal vertices in $\mathcal{S}$, i.e. a vector f in $D(\mathcal{S})$ can be put into the form

$$f = \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}} f_J \frac{\chi_J}{\sqrt{\nu(J)}} \quad (2)$$

where the summation runs over minimal elements in $\mathcal{S}$.

¹The space $D(\mathcal{S})$ is a finite dimensional space of test functions on the ultrametric space X and is an analogue of the Bruhat–Schwartz space of test functions of p -adic argument. The space $D(X)$ of test functions on X is the inductive limit of the spaces $D(\mathcal{S})$: $D(X) = \lim_{\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}} \text{ind}_{\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}} D(\mathcal{S})$.

Consider the operator $Q(\mathcal{S}) = \Pi(\mathcal{S})T$ in $D(\mathcal{S})$, where $\Pi(\mathcal{S})$ is the orthogonal projection in the space $L^2(X, \nu)$ onto $D(\mathcal{S})$, and T is an ultrametric pseudodifferential operator (PDO), see the Appendix. Operator $Q(\mathcal{S})$ is an operator in finite dimensional linear space $D(\mathcal{S})$.

Lemma 2 *Action of $Q(\mathcal{S}) = \Pi(\mathcal{S})T$ on the functions (2) in $D(\mathcal{S})$ is given by the formula*

$$(Q(\mathcal{S})f)_I = \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}} \sqrt{\nu(I)\nu(J)}T(\sup(I, J)) \left[\sqrt{\frac{\nu(J)}{\nu(I)}}f_I - f_J \right] + C_S f_I;$$

where

$$C_S = \int_{y \notin K} d\nu(y)T(I, y) = \sum_{L > K} T(L) (\nu(L) - \nu(L-1, K))$$

and I, J run over the minimal vertices in $\mathcal{S}$. Here $L-1, K$ is the maximal subball in L , which is larger than K .

Proof Take $I \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}$ and consider the scalar product in $L^2(X, \nu)$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \frac{\chi_I}{\sqrt{\nu(I)}}, T \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}} f_J \frac{\chi_J}{\sqrt{\nu(J)}} \right\rangle = \\ &= \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\nu(I)\nu(J)}} f_J \int_{x \in I} d\nu(x) \int d\nu(y) T(x, y) (\chi_J(x) - \chi_J(y)) = \\ &= \frac{1}{\nu(I)} f_I \int_{x \in I} d\nu(x) \int d\nu(y) T(x, y) (\chi_I(x) - \chi_I(y)) + \\ &+ \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}, J \neq I} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\nu(I)\nu(J)}} f_J \int_{x \in I} d\nu(x) \int d\nu(y) T(x, y) (\chi_J(x) - \chi_J(y)) = \\ &= \frac{1}{\nu(I)} f_I \int_{x \in I} d\nu(x) \int_{y \notin I} d\nu(y) T(x, y) - \\ &- \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}, J \neq I} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\nu(I)\nu(J)}} T(\sup(I, J)) f_J \int_{x \in I} d\nu(x) \int d\nu(y) \chi_J(y) = \\ &= f_I \int_{y \notin I} d\nu(y) T(I, y) - \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}, J \neq I} \sqrt{\nu(I)\nu(J)} T(\sup(I, J)) f_J = \\ &= f_I \int_{y \notin K} d\nu(y) T(I, y) + f_I \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}, J \neq I} \nu(J) T(\sup(I, J)) - \\ &- \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}, J \neq I} \sqrt{\nu(I)\nu(J)} T(\sup(I, J)) f_J = \\ &= f_I \int_{y \notin K} d\nu(y) T(I, y) + \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}} \sqrt{\nu(I)\nu(J)} T(\sup(I, J)) \left[\sqrt{\frac{\nu(J)}{\nu(I)}} f_I - f_J \right]. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma.

Therefore, the operator $Q(\mathcal{S})$ corresponds to the block matrix:

$$Q_{IJ} = \sqrt{\nu(I)\nu(J)}T(\sup(I, J)), \quad I, J \in \mathcal{S}_{\min} \quad (3)$$

This kind of replica matrix we call *the sup-matrix*.

Remark Note that $T(I, y)$ in the expression for $C_{\mathcal{S}}$ does not depend on $I \in \mathcal{S}$ and depends only on $K = \sup \mathcal{S}$. The constant $C_{\mathcal{S}}$ tends to zero if the largest vertex of $\mathcal{S}$ tends to infinity. We will ignore the contribution containing $C_{\mathcal{S}}$ in the following.

3 Analysis on trees

In the present section we discuss the analysis on directed trees $\mathcal{T}(X)$ of balls in X . We define tree derivation and integration over the subtrees of regular type. These results generalize the results of [1], [2].

Definition 3 For the function $F(J)$ on the directed tree $\mathcal{T}$ the function

$$\Delta F(J) = F(J) - \sum_{j=0, \dots, p_J-1: J_j < J, |JJ_j|=1} F(J_j) \quad (4)$$

we call *the tree derivative*.

The tree integral over the subtree of the regular type $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{T}$ we define as

$$\int_{\mathcal{S}} F = \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} F(J)$$

Here $\mathcal{S}_{\min}$ is the set of minimal elements in $\mathcal{S}$, distance $|IJ|$ between vertices of the tree is the number of edges in the path connecting I and J , p_J is the branching index of vertex J in the tree $\mathcal{T}$. The branching index of vertex J is equal to p_J if J is incident to p_J decreasing links in $\mathcal{T}$ with the beginning in J . In the language of the corresponding ultrametric space X vertex J has the branching index p_J , if the corresponding ball J has p_J maximal subballs.

In the following in the notation for the tree derivative for simplicity instead of (4) we use the simplified notation

$$\Delta F(J) = F(J) - \sum_j F(J_j)$$

The next lemma relates the analysis on the directed tree and the analysis on the corresponding ultrametric space. This shows, that generalized functions at X can be considered as the constants of tree derivation at $\mathcal{T}$.

Lemma 4 *The space of solutions of the equation*

$$\Delta F(J) = 0$$

is isomorphic, as a linear space, to the space of generalized functions at X , with the isomorphism defined by the formula

$$\phi_F(\chi_J) = F(J)$$

Here ϕ_F is the generalized function at X , corresponding to the function F at the tree, and χ_J is the characteristic function of the disk J .

Proof The proof is by the remark that a generalized function on the ultrametric space X is defined unambiguously by its values (as of the functional) on the characteristic functions of disks.

Characteristic functions of disks are not linearly independent, but are related as follows

$$\chi_J = \sum_{j=0, \dots, p_J-1: J_j < J, |JJ_j|=1} \chi_{J_j}$$

By linearity of generalized functions, this implies the following conditions of the values of generalized functions:

$$\phi(\chi_J) = \sum_{j=0, \dots, p_J-1: J_j < J, |JJ_j|=1} \phi(\chi_{J_j})$$

Choosing $F(J) = \phi(\chi_J)$, we get exactly

$$\Delta F(J) = 0$$

Since no other restrictions on $F(J)$ are put, this proves the lemma.

There exist several analogies between the introduced analysis on trees and the analysis of functions of real argument. We have the following partial analogue of the Leibnitz rule

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta F(J)G(J) &= F(J)G(J) - \sum_{j=0, \dots, p_J-1: J_j < J, |JJ_j|=1} F(J_j)G(J_j) = \\ &= F(J)G(J) - \sum_j F(J_j)G(J) + \sum_j F(J_j)G(J) - \sum_j F(J_j)G(J_j) = \\ &= [F(J) - \sum_j F(J_j)]G(J) + \sum_j F(J_j)[G(J) - G(J_j)] = \\ &= [F(J) - \sum_j F(J_j)]G(J) + F(J) \sum_j [G(J) - G(J_j)] - \sum_j [F(J) - F(J_j)][G(J) - G(J_j)] \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

The next lemma gives the tree analogue of the Newton–Leibnitz formula

$$\int_a^b \frac{df(x)}{dx} dx = f(b) - f(a)$$

This lemma shows the importance of the notion of a subtree of the regular type.

Lemma 5 For the subtree $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{T}$ of the regular type the following tree Newton–Leibnitz formula is satisfied

$$\int_{\mathcal{S}} \Delta F(J) = F(K) - \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}} F(J)$$

In the next two formulas the tree derivative is taken with respect to J .

Lemma 6

$$\Delta \sum_{L \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}: L \leq J} F(L) = F(J) \quad (6)$$

$$\Delta \left[\nu(J) \sum_{L: J \leq L \leq K} F(L) \right] = - \sum_{j=0, \dots, p_J-1: J_j < J, |JJ_j|=1} \nu(J_j) F(J_j) \quad (7)$$

The formula (6) (respectively (7)) is the tree analogue of the derivative of the integral over the higher (respectively the lower) limit.

The next lemma is the analogue of the following change of order of integration:

$$\int_a^b f(x) \left[\int_a^x g(y) dy \right] dx = \int_a^b g(y) \left[\int_y^b f(x) dx \right] dy$$

Lemma 7

$$\sum_{L \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} F(L) \sum_{B \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}: B < L} G(B) = \sum_{L \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} G(L) \sum_{B: L < B \leq K} F(B)$$

The above sums are the analogues of integration over several variables.

4 Computations with replica matrices

In the present section we compute the products and traces of the degrees for replica matrices under investigation. Some similar computations for p -adic case can be found in [4]. The next lemma gives some useful formulas for computations on the subtrees of the regular type.

Lemma 8

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}: \sup(I, J) = L} \nu(J) &= \nu(L) - \nu(L-1, I) \\ \sum_{I, J \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}: \sup(I, J) = L} \nu(I) \nu(J) &= \nu^2(L) - \sum_{j: L_j < L, |LL_j|=1} \nu^2(L_j) = \Delta \nu^2(L) \end{aligned}$$

Here $L-1, I$ is the maximal subball in L , which contains the ball I .

Proof of the lemma is by additivity of the measure ν .

The following lemma computes the important in the replica approach functional $\sum_{a \neq b} Q_{ab}$.

Lemma 9

$$\sum_{I, J \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}; I \neq J} \nu(I) \nu(J) T(\sup(I, J)) = \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} T(J) \Delta \nu^2(J)$$

Proof Computing the sum over J we get

$$\sum_{I, J \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}; I \neq J} \nu(I) \nu(J) T(\sup(I, J)) = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}} \nu(I) \sum_{I < L \leq K} T(L) \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}: \sup(I, J) = L} \nu(J)$$

where K is the largest vertex in $\mathcal{S}$. This reduces to

$$\sum_{I \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}} \nu(I) \sum_{I < L \leq K} T(L) (\nu(L) - \nu(L - 1, I)) = \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} T(J) \Delta \nu^2(J)$$

This finishes the proof of the lemma.

Prove the following important lemma, which allows to compute products of replica matrices in terms of summation over the paths in corresponding trees.

Lemma 10 For $I, J \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}$ one has: if $I \neq J$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{L \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}, L \neq I, J} \nu(L) T_1(\sup(I, L)) T_2(\sup(L, J)) = \\ &= \sum_{L: \sup(I, J) < L \leq K} (\nu(L) - \nu(L - 1, \sup(I, J))) T_1(L) T_2(L) + \\ &+ \sum_{L: I < L < \sup(I, J)} (\nu(L) - \nu(L - 1, I)) T_1(L) T_2(\sup(I, J)) + \\ &+ \sum_{L: J < L < \sup(I, J)} (\nu(L) - \nu(L - 1, J)) T_1(\sup(I, J)) T_2(L) + \\ &+ (\nu(\sup(I, J)) - \nu(\sup(I, J) - 1, I) - \nu(\sup(I, J) - 1, J)) T_1(\sup(I, J)) T_2(\sup(I, J)) \end{aligned}$$

and for $I = J$ one has

$$\sum_{L \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}, L \neq I} \nu(L) T_1(\sup(I, L)) T_2(\sup(L, I)) = \sum_{L: I < L \leq K} (\nu(L) - \nu(L - 1, I)) T_1(L) T_2(L)$$

In particular

$$\sum_{L \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}, L \neq I} \nu(L) T(\sup(I, L))^2 = \sum_{L: I < L \leq K} (\nu(L) - \nu(L - 1, I)) T(L)^2 \quad (8)$$

Proof Compute for $I \neq J$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{L \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}, L \neq I, J} \nu(L) T_1(\sup(I, L)) T_2(\sup(L, J)) = \\ &= \sum_{L \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}, L \neq I, J: \sup(L, \sup(I, J)) > \sup(I, J)} \nu(L) T_1(\sup(I, L)) T_2(\sup(L, J)) + \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \sum_{L \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}, L \neq I, J: \sup(L, I) < \sup(I, J)} \nu(L) T_1(\sup(I, L)) T_2(\sup(L, J)) + \\
& + \sum_{L \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}, L \neq I, J: \sup(L, J) < \sup(I, J)} \nu(L) T_1(\sup(I, L)) T_2(\sup(L, J)) + \\
& + \sum_{L \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}, L \neq I, J: \sup(L, I) = \sup(L, J) = \sup(I, J)} \nu(L) T_1(\sup(I, L)) T_2(\sup(L, J)) \\
& = \sum_{L: \sup(I, J) < L \leq K} (\nu(L) - \nu(L-1, \sup(I, J))) T_1(L) T_2(L) + \\
& + \sum_{L: I < L < \sup(I, J)} (\nu(L) - \nu(L-1, I)) T_1(L) T_2(\sup(I, J)) + \\
& + \sum_{L: J < L < \sup(I, J)} (\nu(L) - \nu(L-1, J)) T_1(\sup(I, J)) T_2(L) + \\
& + (\nu(\sup(I, J)) - \nu(\sup(I, J) - 1, I) - \nu(\sup(I, J) - 1, J)) T_1(\sup(I, J)) T_2(\sup(I, J))
\end{aligned}$$

Analogously, for $I = J$ one obtains

$$\sum_{L \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}, L \neq I} \nu(L) T_1(\sup(I, L)) T_2(\sup(L, I)) = \sum_{L: I < L \leq K} (\nu(L) - \nu(L-1, I)) T_1(L) T_2(L)$$

This finishes the proof of the lemma.

The next lemma gives the trace of the cubic combination of the replica matrices.

Lemma 11 *For the trace of the cubic combination of the replica block matrices we get*

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{tr } Q_1 Q_2 Q_3 &= \sum_{A, B, C \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}, A \neq B, B \neq C, C \neq A} \nu(A) \nu(B) \nu(C) T_1(\sup(A, B)) T_2(\sup(B, C)) T_3(\sup(C, A)) = \\
&= \sum_{B \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} T_1(B) T_2(B) T_3(B) (3\nu(B) \Delta \nu^2(B) - 2\Delta \nu^3(B)) + \\
&\quad + \sum_{B \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} \Delta \nu^2(B) \sum_{L: B < L \leq K} (\nu(L) - \nu(L-1, B)) \\
&\quad [T_1(L) T_2(L) T_3(B) + T_2(L) T_3(L) T_1(B) + T_3(L) T_1(L) T_2(B)] \tag{9}
\end{aligned}$$

The property of the sum in (9), that two of the three (or even three of the three) indices I of the coefficients $T(I)$ coincide, and the two coinciding indices are larger than the third, is related to the fact that in ultrametric space all triangles are equilateral with equal larger edges. The analogous observations for the Parisi RSB anzats were made in [21]. Note that here (unlike in [21]) we did not yet introduce any kind of the $n \rightarrow 0$ limit.

Proof of Lemma 11 Compute

$$\sum_{A, B, C \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}, A \neq B, B \neq C, C \neq A} \nu(A) \nu(B) \nu(C) T_1(\sup(A, B)) T_2(\sup(B, C)) T_3(\sup(C, A)) =$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{A, C \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}; C \neq A} \nu(A) \nu(C) T_3(\sup(C, A)) \\
&\quad \left[\sum_{B: \sup(A, C) < B \leq K} (\nu(B) - \nu(B-1, \sup(A, C))) T_1(B) T_2(B) + \right. \\
&\quad + \left[\sum_{B: A < B < \sup(A, C)} (\nu(B) - \nu(B-1, A)) T_1(B) \right] T_2(\sup(A, C)) + \\
&\quad + T_1(\sup(A, C)) \left[\sum_{B: C < B < \sup(A, C)} (\nu(B) - \nu(B-1, C)) T_2(B) \right] + \\
&\quad \left. + (\nu(\sup(A, C)) - \nu(\sup(A, C) - 1, A) - \nu(\sup(A, C) - 1, C)) T_1(\sup(A, C)) T_2(\sup(A, C)) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

Discuss the second contribution to the above sum, i.e. the expression

$$\sum_{A, C \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}; C \neq A} \nu(A) \nu(C) T_2(\sup(A, C)) T_3(\sup(C, A)) \left[\sum_{B: A < B < \sup(A, C)} (\nu(B) - \nu(B-1, A)) T_1(B) \right]$$

In this expression we put the summation in the form of the following composition of the three summations

$$\sum_{A, C \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}; C \neq A} = \sum_{C \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}} \sum_{L: C < L \leq K} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}: \sup(A, C) = L}$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{C \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}} \sum_{L: C < L \leq K} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}: \sup(A, C) = L} \nu(A) \nu(C) T_2(\sup(A, C)) T_3(\sup(C, A)) \\
&\quad \left[\sum_{B: A < B < \sup(A, C)} (\nu(B) - \nu(B-1, A)) T_1(B) \right] = \\
&= \sum_{C \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}} \nu(C) \sum_{L: C < L \leq K} T_2(L) T_3(L) \sum_{A \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}: \sup(A, C) = L} \nu(A) \left[\sum_{B: A < B < L} (\nu(B) - \nu(B-1, A)) T_1(B) \right] = \\
&= \sum_{C \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}} \nu(C) \sum_{L: C < L \leq K} T_2(L) T_3(L) \left[\sum_{B \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}: B < L, \sup(B, C) = L} T_1(B) \Delta \nu^2(B) \right] = \\
&= \sum_{L \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} T_2(L) T_3(L) \sum_{C \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}: C < L} \nu(C) \left[\sum_{B \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}: B < L, \sup(B, C) = L} T_1(B) \Delta \nu^2(B) \right] = \\
&= \sum_{L \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} T_2(L) T_3(L) \left[\sum_{B \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}: B < L} T_1(B) (\nu(L) - \nu(L-1, B)) \Delta \nu^2(B) \right] = \\
&= \sum_{B \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} T_1(B) \Delta \nu^2(B) \left[\sum_{L: B < L \leq K} T_2(L) T_3(L) (\nu(L) - \nu(L-1, B)) \right] \quad (10)
\end{aligned}$$

Analogously, the third contribution

$$\sum_{A,C \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}; C \neq A} \nu(A)\nu(C)T_1(\sup(A, C))T_3(\sup(C, A)) \left[\sum_{B: C < B < \sup(A, C)} (\nu(B) - \nu(B-1, C)) T_2(B) \right]$$

will give

$$\sum_{B \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} T_2(B) \Delta \nu^2(B) \left[\sum_{L: B < L \leq K} T_1(L)T_3(L)(\nu(L) - \nu(L-1, B)) \right] \quad (11)$$

Compute the first contribution. We get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{A,C \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}; C \neq A} \nu(A)\nu(C)T_3(\sup(C, A)) \left[\sum_{B: \sup(A, C) < B \leq K} (\nu(B) - \nu(B-1, \sup(A, C))) T_1(B)T_2(B) \right] = \\ & = \sum_{B \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} T_3(B) \Delta \nu^2(B) \left[\sum_{L: B < L \leq K} T_1(L)T_2(L)(\nu(L) - \nu(L-1, B)) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

The fourth contribution reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{A,C \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}; C \neq A} \nu(A)\nu(C)T_1(\sup(A, C))T_2(\sup(A, C))T_3(\sup(C, A)) \\ & (\nu(\sup(A, C)) - \nu(\sup(A, C) - 1, A) - \nu(\sup(A, C) - 1, C)) = \\ & = \sum_{B \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} T_1(B)T_2(B)T_3(B) \left(\nu(B) \Delta \nu^2(B) - 2 \sum_{j: B_j < B, |BB_j|=1} \nu^2(B_j) (\nu(B) - \nu(B_j)) \right) = \\ & = \sum_{B \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} T_1(B)T_2(B)T_3(B) (3\nu(B) \Delta \nu^2(B) - 2\Delta \nu^3(B)) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Combining formulas (10)–(13), we obtain the proof of the lemma.

5 The $n \rightarrow 0$ limit: definition

The present and the next sections are written at the physical level of rigor. In the present section we describe the generalization of the $n \rightarrow 0$ limit of replica approach, relevant to the introduced replica symmetry breaking (RSB) anzats.

Consider the map η , which acts on the measures $\nu(J)$ of ultrametric disks according to the following rules:

1) Normalization:

$$\eta(\nu(R)) = 1 \quad (14)$$

where R is the root of the tree, for which $\nu(R) = 1$. Here R is some vertex of the tree $\mathcal{T}(X)$ (the root of the tree).

2) Monotonicity and infinitesimality:

$$\eta(\mu(J)) > \eta(\nu(I)) \quad (15)$$

for $I > J$ and, moreover,

$$d\eta(\nu(J)) = \eta(\nu(J)) - \eta(\nu(J+1)) \quad \text{is a positive infinitesimal value} \quad (16)$$

where $J+1$ is the smallest vertex larger than J .

3) Vanishing of the limit:

$$\lim_{I \rightarrow \infty} \eta(\nu(I)) = 0. \quad (17)$$

We will perform computations with subtrees $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{T}$ of regular type. We will take $R \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}$ and will claim, that $\eta(\nu(J))$ for $J \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}$ should be equal to 1 up to infinitesimal corrections which we will neglect.

The rule (17) means that the limit $n \rightarrow 0$ is related to the limit $I \rightarrow \infty$ in the directed tree. Thus our construction indeed is a variant of the $n \rightarrow 0$ limit, since in our approach $\nu(I)$ coincides with the dimension n of the replica matrix (when I is the maximal vertex in the subtree $\mathcal{S}$ of the regular type).

Condition (16) may be discussed as the corollary of the fact that in the $n \rightarrow 0$ limit for any J one has $p_J \rightarrow 1 - \varepsilon$ for infinitesimal ε (since the ball $J+1$, roughly speaking, is p_{J+1} times larger than the ball J). Some variant of the analogous construction was described in paper [4], where, in the p -adic case, the $n \rightarrow 0$ limit was discussed as the map $p \mapsto 1 - \varepsilon$, $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, which is the analogue of the formula (16).

Then, we introduce the $n \rightarrow 0$ limit in the RSB anzats under consideration as the map ρ , which acts on the polynomials over the variables, equal to the measures of the ultrametric disks $\nu(J)$. This map is linear with respect to addition and multiplication by numbers, and action on the monomials of $\nu(J)$ is defined as follows:

$$\rho(\nu^k(J)) = \nu(J)\eta^{k-1}(\nu(J)) \quad (18)$$

The formulas (14)–(17) are the direct analogues of the definitions of the $n \rightarrow 0$ limit for the Parisi anzats, and the formula (18) is the new condition which was trivial for the Parisi anzats, and becomes nontrivial in the case under consideration.

6 The $n \rightarrow 0$ limit: computation

Investigate the introduced $n \rightarrow 0$ limit construction for the case, which is the direct generalization of the Parisi anzats for the case of general ultrametric space.

Lemma 12 *For the case, when the replica matrix is defined by the function of the measures of ultrametric disks*

$$T(J) = F(\nu(J)) \quad (19)$$

the functional

$$\frac{1}{\nu(K)} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} T(J) \Delta \nu^2(J) \quad (20)$$

in the $n \rightarrow 0$ limit, in the case when the function F is continuous on the interval $[0, 1]$, takes the form

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{ab} Q_{ab} = - \int_0^1 F(x) dm(x) \quad (21)$$

where the integral on the interval $[0, 1]$ is defined as

$$\int_0^1 F(x) dm(x) = \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu(K)} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S}} F(\rho(\nu(J))) \nu(J) d\rho(\nu(J))$$

i.e. the measure $dm(x)$ is defined as

$$m([a, b]) = \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\nu(K)} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S}: \rho(\nu(J)) \in [a, b]} \nu(J) d\rho(\nu(J))$$

for $[a, b] \subset [0, 1]$.

Proof By (5) we have

$$\rho(\Delta \nu^2(J)) = - \sum_{j=0}^{p_J-1} \nu(J_j) d\rho(\nu(J_j))$$

Therefore

$$\rho \left[\frac{1}{\nu(K)} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} T(J) \Delta \nu^2(J) \right] = - \frac{1}{\nu(K)} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S} \setminus K} \rho[T(J+1)] \nu(J) d\rho(\nu(J))$$

For the case $T(J) = F(\nu(J))$ this takes the form

$$- \frac{1}{\nu(K)} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S} \setminus K} F(\rho(\nu(J))) \nu(J) d\rho(\nu(J))$$

which for continuous F reduces to

$$- \frac{1}{\nu(K)} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S} \setminus K} F(\rho(\nu(J))) \nu(J) d\rho(\nu(J))$$

Application of the $K \rightarrow \infty$ limit proves the lemma.

Remark It is interesting to discuss this result for the case when $T(J) = T = \text{const.}$ Consider the identity

$$\begin{aligned} T(J) \Delta \nu^2(J) &= T(J) \nu^2(J) - \sum_{j=0}^{p_J-1} T(J_j) \nu^2(J_j) + \sum_{j=0}^{p_J-1} T(J_j) \nu^2(J_j) - T(J) \sum_{j=0}^{p_J-1} \nu^2(J_j) = \\ &= \Delta [T(J) \nu^2(J)] - \sum_{j=0}^{p_J-1} [T(J) - T(J_j)] \nu^2(J_j) \end{aligned}$$

Applying the tree Newton–Leibnitz formula, we get for the functional (20)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{\nu(K)} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} T(J) \Delta \nu^2(J) = \\
& = \frac{1}{\nu(K)} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} \left[\Delta [T(J) \nu^2(J)] - \sum_{j=0}^{p_J-1} [T(J) - T(J_j)] \nu^2(J_j) \right] = \\
& = T(K) \nu(K) - \frac{1}{\nu(K)} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}} T(J) \nu^2(J) - \frac{1}{\nu(K)} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} \sum_{j=0}^{p_J-1} [T(J) - T(J_j)] \nu^2(J_j)
\end{aligned}$$

which for the case $T(J) = T = \text{const}$ reduces to

$$T \left(\nu(K) - \frac{1}{\nu(K)} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}} \nu^2(J) \right)$$

Then application of the $n \rightarrow 0$ limit gives

$$T \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \left(\rho(\nu(K)) - \frac{1}{\nu(K)} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}} \nu(J) \rho(\nu(J)) \right) = -T$$

We see that the computation of this value includes the summation $\sum_{J \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}} \nu(J)$, i.e. the integration of the measure ν over the ultrametric space.

7 Replica symmetry breaking equation

In the present section we, using variational procedure and the introduced analysis on trees, find the equation, which describes replica symmetry breaking for the Sherrington–Kirkpatrick model in the vicinity of phase transition (in other words, when matrix elements of the replica matrix can be considered as small parameters). In this vicinity the free energy can be decomposed into the series of the functionals (of the type of traces of the degrees) of the replica matrix. Functionals of this kind (corresponding to the first several terms of the series) we computed in Section 4. Let us compute variations of these functionals with respect to variations of the matrix elements $T(J)$.

Lemma 13 *Variations of the following functionals have the form*

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta \text{tr} Q^2 &= \delta \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} T(J)^2 \Delta \nu^2(J) = \\
&= \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} 2T(J) \delta T(J) \Delta \nu^2(J)
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta \sum_{ij} Q_{ij}^4 &= \delta \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} T(J)^4 \Delta \nu^2(J) = \\
&= \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} 4T(J)^3 \delta T(J) \Delta \nu^2(J)
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Lemma 14 *Variation of the cubic functional takes the form*

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta \operatorname{tr} Q^3 &= \delta \left[\sum_{B \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} \left(3\nu(B)\Delta\nu^2(B) - 2\Delta\nu^3(B) \right) T(B)^3 + \right. \\
&+ 3 \sum_{B \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} \Delta\nu^2(B) \sum_{L: B < L \leq K} (\nu(L) - \nu(L-1, B)) T(L)^2 T(B) \left. \right] = \\
&= 3 \sum_{B \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} \delta T(B) \left[\left(3\nu(B)\Delta\nu^2(B) - 2\Delta\nu^3(B) \right) T(B)^2 + \right. \\
&+ 2T(B) \sum_{L \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}: L < B} (\nu(B) - \nu(B-1, L)) T(L) \Delta\nu^2(L) + \\
&\left. + \Delta\nu^2(B) \sum_{L: B < L \leq K} (\nu(L) - \nu(L-1, B)) T(L)^2 \right] \tag{24}
\end{aligned}$$

Proof We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta \operatorname{tr} Q^3 &= \sum_{B \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} \left(3\nu(B)\Delta\nu^2(B) - 2\Delta\nu^3(B) \right) 3T(B)^2 \delta T(B) + \\
&+ 3 \sum_{B \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} \Delta\nu^2(B) \sum_{L: B < L \leq K} (\nu(L) - \nu(L-1, B)) \left(2T(L)T(B)\delta T(L) + T(L)^2 \delta T(B) \right) = \\
&= \sum_{B \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} \left(3\nu(B)\Delta\nu^2(B) - 2\Delta\nu^3(B) \right) 3T(B)^2 \delta T(B) + \\
&+ 6 \sum_{L \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} T(L) \Delta\nu^2(L) \sum_{B: L < B \leq K} (\nu(B) - \nu(B-1, L)) T(B) \delta T(B) + \\
&+ 3 \sum_{B \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} \Delta\nu^2(B) \delta T(B) \sum_{L: B < L \leq K} (\nu(L) - \nu(L-1, B)) T(L)^2 = \\
&= \sum_{B \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} \left(3\nu(B)\Delta\nu^2(B) - 2\Delta\nu^3(B) \right) 3T(B)^2 \delta T(B) + \\
&+ 6 \sum_{B \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} T(B) \delta T(B) \sum_{L \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}: L < B} (\nu(B) - \nu(B-1, L)) T(L) \Delta\nu^2(L) + \\
&+ 3 \sum_{B \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} \Delta\nu^2(B) \delta T(B) \sum_{L: B < L \leq K} (\nu(L) - \nu(L-1, B)) T(L)^2 = \\
&= 3 \sum_{B \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}} \delta T(B) \left[\left(3\nu(B)\Delta\nu^2(B) - 2\Delta\nu^3(B) \right) T(B)^2 + \right. \\
&+ 2T(B) \sum_{L \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}: L < B} (\nu(B) - \nu(B-1, L)) T(L) \Delta\nu^2(L) + \\
&\left. + \Delta\nu^2(B) \sum_{L: B < L \leq K} (\nu(L) - \nu(L-1, B)) T(L)^2 \right]
\end{aligned}$$

Here we used the transformation from lemma 7 (change of order of integration in the tree integral). This finishes the proof of the lemma.

Consider the functional which approximates the free energy of the Sherrington–Kirkpatrick model near phase transition, when the replica matrix can be considered as a small parameter. This functional, which can be obtained by decomposition of the free energy into the Taylor series and summation over the spin degrees of freedom, has the form [17]

$$F = a_2 \text{tr} Q^2 + a_3 \text{tr} Q^3 + a_4 \sum_{ij} Q_{ij}^4 \quad (25)$$

where a_2, a_3, a_4 are some constants. To obtain the replica solution, one has to vary this functional, in the framework of the replica anzats under consideration, over the parameters of the anzats and consider the equation

$$\delta F = 0$$

which is called the replica symmetry breaking equation.

For the replica anzats under consideration we vary the free energy over the parameters $T(L)$. Combining the lemmas 13, 14, we get the following theorem:

Theorem 15 *Replica symmetry breaking equation $\delta F = 0$ for the free energy (25) in the frameworks of replica anzats (1) takes the form*

$$\begin{aligned} & 2a_2 T(B) \Delta \nu^2(B) + 4a_4 T(B)^3 \Delta \nu^2(B) + \\ & + 3a_3 \left[\left(3\nu(B) \Delta \nu^2(B) - 2\Delta \nu^3(B) \right) T(B)^2 + \right. \\ & + 2T(B) \sum_{L \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\min}: L < B} (\nu(B) - \nu(B-1, L)) T(L) \Delta \nu^2(L) + \\ & \left. + \Delta \nu^2(B) \sum_{L: B < L \leq K} (\nu(L) - \nu(L-1, B)) T(L)^2 \right] = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

8 The constant RSB solution

In the present section we check, that the constant replica matrix, for which $T(J) = T = \text{const}$, indeed is a solution of (26) (in the $n \rightarrow 0$ limit). If we substitute $T(J) = T$ into (26), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & 2a_2 T \Delta \nu^2(B) + 4a_4 T^3 \Delta \nu^2(B) + \\ & + 3a_3 T^2 \left[3\nu(B) \Delta \nu^2(B) - 2\Delta \nu^3(B) + \right. \\ & + 2 \sum_{j=1}^{p_B-1} (\nu(B) - \nu(B_j)) \left(\nu^2(B_j) - \sum_{L \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}: L < B_j} \nu^2(L) \right) + \\ & \left. + \Delta \nu^2(B) (\nu(K) - \nu(B)) \right] = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

This transforms into

$$2a_2T\Delta\nu^2(B) + 4a_4T^3\Delta\nu^2(B) + 3a_3T^2\left[\nu(K)\Delta\nu^2(B) - \sum_{j=1}^{p_B-1}(\nu(B) - \nu(B_j)) \sum_{L \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}: L < B_j} \nu^2(L)\right] = 0$$

Apply the $n \rightarrow 0$ limit (i.e. the map ρ). We get, taking into account that $\rho(\nu(K)) \rightarrow 0$ for $K \rightarrow \infty$ and $\rho(\nu(L)) \rightarrow 1$ for $L \in \mathcal{S}_{\min}$

$$2a_2T\rho(\Delta\nu^2(B)) + 4a_4T^3\rho(\Delta\nu^2(B)) - 3a_3T^2\left[2 \sum_{j=1}^{p_B-1} \rho(\nu(B) - \nu(B_j))\nu(B_j)\right] = 0$$

Since the combination in square brackets is exactly $2\rho(\Delta\nu^2(B))$, we get the equation

$$(2a_2T + 4a_4T^3 - 6a_3T^2)\rho(\Delta\nu^2(B)) = 0$$

which has the solution $T = 0$ (trivial), and the solutions

$$T = \frac{3a_3 \pm \sqrt{9a_3^2 - 8a_2a_4}}{4a_4} = \mp \frac{a_2}{3a_3}$$

The last equality holds if a_2 is a small parameter (which is satisfied for the Sherrington–Kirkpatrick model in the considered regime).

For the Parisi RSB anzats the obtained solution reduces to the solution with unbroken replica symmetry. For the considered RSB anzats the constant RSB solution depends on general ultrametric space X and a measure of generic form on this space, and therefore it describes a wide class of physical situations.

9 Appendix: Ultrametric PDO

Definition 16 *An ultrametric space is a metric space with the ultrametric $|xy|$ (where $|xy|$ is called the distance between x and y), i.e. the function of two variables, satisfying the properties of positivity and non degeneracy*

$$|xy| \geq 0, \quad |xy| = 0 \implies x = y;$$

symmetricity

$$|xy| = |yx|;$$

and the strong triangle inequality

$$|xy| \leq \max(|xz|, |yz|), \quad \forall z.$$

Consider an ultrametric space X , satisfying the following properties:

- 1) The set of all the balls of nonzero diameter in X is no more than countable;
- 2) For any two balls I, J in X and any sequence of balls $\{D^{(k)}\}$, for which $I \subset D^{(k)} \subset J$ for all k , the sequence $\{D^{(k)}\}$ must be finite;
- 3) Any ball is a finite union of maximal subballs.

For ultrametric space X consider the set $\mathcal{T}(X)$, which contains all the balls in X of nonzero diameter, and the balls of zero diameter which are maximal subballs in balls of nonzero diameter. On this tree there is the structure of directed set, generated by the order on balls (ordered by inclusion).

If a non-maximal vertex $I \in \mathcal{T}$ is incident to $p_I + 1$ edges, we will say that the branching index of I is p_I . If maximal index $I \in \mathcal{T}$ is incident to p_I edges, we will say that the branching index of I is p_I . Equivalently, branching index of a vertex I in directed tree is the number of maximal elements, which less than I . The following theorem can be found in [20] (the analogous result was obtained in [22], see also [23] where it was presented).

Theorem 17 *The set $\mathcal{T}(X)$ which corresponds to the ultrametric space X , satisfying properties (1), (2), (3) above with the partial order, defined by inclusion of balls, is a directed tree where all neighbor vertices are comparable.*

Branching index for vertices of this tree may take finite integer non-negative values not equal to one, and the maximal vertex (if exists) has the branching index ≥ 2 . Balls of nonzero diameter in X correspond to vertices of branching index ≥ 2 in $\mathcal{T}(X)$, and the balls of zero diameter which are maximal subballs in balls of nonzero diameter correspond to vertices of branching index 0 in $\mathcal{T}(X)$.

Remind that a directed set is a partially ordered set, where for any pair of elements there exists the unique supremum with respect to the partial order.

Consider the set $X \cup \mathcal{T}(X)$, where we identify the balls of zero diameter from $\mathcal{T}(X)$ with the corresponding points in X . We call $\mathcal{T}(X)$ the tree of balls in X , and $X \cup \mathcal{T}(X)$ the extended tree of balls. One can say that $X \cup \mathcal{T}(X)$ is the set of all the balls in X , of nonzero and zero diameter.

Introduce the structure of a directed set on $X \cup \mathcal{T}(X)$. At the tree $\mathcal{T}(X)$ this structure is the following: $I < J$ if for the corresponding balls $I \subset J$.

The supremum

$$\sup(x, y) = I$$

of points $x, y \in X$ is the minimal ball I , containing the both points.

Analogously, for $J \in \mathcal{T}(X)$ and $x \in X$ the supremum

$$\sup(x, J) = I$$

is the minimal ball I , which contains the ball J and the point x .

Conversely, starting from a directed tree one can reproduce the corresponding ultrametric space [19], [20], [22], [24], which will be the absolute of the directed tree.

Consider a measure ν on ultrametric space X , such that for arbitrary ball D its measure $\nu(D)$ is a positive number (i.e. is not equal to zero or to infinity).

We study the ultrametric pseudodifferential operator (or the PDO) of the form considered in [19], [20]

$$Tf(x) = \int T(\sup(x, y))(f(x) - f(y))d\nu(y)$$

Here $T(I)$ is some function on the tree $\mathcal{T}(X)$. Thus the structure of this operator is determined by the direction on $X \cup \mathcal{T}(X)$. This kind of ultrametric PDO we call *the sup-operator*.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank G.Parisi and I.V.Volovich for fruitful discussions and valuable comments. One of the authors (A.Kh.) would like to thank S.Albeverio for fruitful discussions and support of p -adic investigations. This paper has been partly supported by EU-Network "Quantum Probability and Applications". One of the authors (S.V.Kozyrev) has been partly supported by the CRDF (grant UM1-2421-KV-02), by The Russian Foundation for Basic Research (project 05-01-00884-a), by the grant of the President of Russian Federation for the support of scientific schools NSh 1542.2003.1, by the Program of the Department of Mathematics of Russian Academy of Science "Modern problems of theoretical mathematics", by the grant of The Swedish Royal Academy of Sciences on collaboration with scientists of former Soviet Union, and by the grants DFG Project 436 RUS 113/809/0-1 and RFFI 05-01-04002-NNIO-a.

References

- [1] A.Yu.Khrennikov, S.V.Kozyrev, Replica symmetry breaking related to a general ultrametric space I: replica matrices and functionals, *Physica A*. 2006. V.359.P.222-240
- [2] A.Yu.Khrennikov, S.V.Kozyrev, Replica symmetry breaking related to a general ultrametric space II: RSB solutions and the $n \rightarrow 0$ limit, *Physica A*. 2006. V.359. P.241-266.
- [3] V.A.Avetisov, A.Kh.Bikulov, S.V.Kozyrev, Application of p -adic analysis to models of spontaneous breaking of replica symmetry, *Journal of Physics A*, 1999, Vol.32, pp.8785-8791, <http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/cond-mat/9904360>, Proceedings of the Conference "Quantum Theory: Reconsideration of Foundations", 17-21 June 2001, Växjö, Sweden, edited by A.Khrennikov, Växjö University Press 2002
- [4] G.Parisi, N.Sourlas, p -Adic numbers and replica symmetry breaking, 2000 *European Phys. J. B* **14** 535-542, <http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/cond-mat/9906095>

- [5] C.De Dominicis, D.M.Carlucci, T.Temesvari, Replica Fourier transform on ultrametric trees and block-diagonalizing multireplica matrices // J. Phys. I France. 1997. V. 7. P. 105–115. <http://arxiv.org/abs/cond-mat/9703132>
- [6] V.S.Vladimirov, I.V.Volovich, Ye.I.Zelenov, p -Adic analysis and mathematical physics. World Scientific, Singapore, 1994. Russian Edition: Moscow, Nauka, 1994
- [7] S.V.Kozyrev, Wavelet analysis as a p -adic spectral analysis // Russian Math. Izv. 2002. V. 66. N 2. P. 367. <http://arxiv.org/abs/math-ph/0012019>
- [8] J.J.Benedetto, R.L.Benedetto, A wavelet theory for local fields and related groups, The Journal of Geometric Analysis, 14 (3), 2004, pp. 423–456
- [9] R.L.Benedetto, Examples of wavelets for local fields, <http://arxiv.org/math.CA/abs/0312038>
- [10] S.V.Kozyrev, p -Adic pseudodifferential operators and p -adic wavelets // Theor. Math. Physics. 2004. V. 138. N 3, P. 322–332. <http://arxiv.org/abs/math-ph/0303045>
- [11] I.V.Volovich, p -Adic String, Class. Quantum Gravity, 4(1987)L83-L87
- [12] A.Khrennikov, p -Adic valued distributions in mathematical physics, Kluwer Academic Publ., Dordrecht, 1994
- [13] A.Khrennikov, Non-Archimedean Analysis: Quantum Paradoxes, Dynamical Systems and Biological Models, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997
- [14] A.Khrennikov, p -Adic discrete dynamical systems and their applications in physics and cognitive sciences, Russian Journal of Mathematical Physics, 11 (1), 2004, pp.45–70
- [15] A.N.Kochubei, Pseudo-Differential Equations and Stochastics over Non-Archimedean Fields. New York: Marcel Dekker, 2001.
- [16] V.A.Avetisov, A.Kh.Bikulov, S.V.Kozyrev, V.A.Osipov, p -Adic Models of Ultrametric Diffusion Constrained by Hierarchical Energy Landscapes // J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 2002. V. 35. P. 177–189. <http://arxiv.org/abs/cond-mat/0106506>
- [17] M.Mezard, G.Parisi, M.Virasoro, Spin-Glass Theory and Beyond, Singapore: World Scientific, 1987
- [18] A.Yu.Khrennikov, S.V.Kozyrev, Wavelets on ultrametric spaces, Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis, Volume 19, 2005, P. 61-76
- [19] A. Yu. Khrennikov and S. V. Kozyrev, Pseudodifferential operators on ultrametric spaces and ultrametric wavelets, *Russian Math. Izv.* 2005. V.69.N.5. <http://arxiv.org/abs/math-ph/0412062>

- [20] S.V.Kozyrev, Ultrametric pseudodifferential operators and wavelets for the case of non homogeneous measure, <http://arxiv.org/abs/math-ph/0412082>
- [21] M.Mezard, G.Parisi, N.Sourlas, G.Toulouse, M.Virasoro, Nature of the spin glass phase, *Phys.Rev.Lett.* 52(13), 1984, pp.1156–1159
- [22] A.J.Lemin, The category of ultrametric spaces is isomorphic to the category of complete, atomic, tree-like and real graduated lattices LAT, *Algebra universalis*, 50(1), 2003, pp.35–49
- [23] A.Khrennikov, Classical and quantum mental models and Freud’s theory of unconscious mind, Växjö University Press, 2002
- [24] J.P.Serre, *Trees*. New York, Berlin: Springer Verlag, 1980.